

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given to the present application. The current application has claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, and 15-25 pending. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, 15 and 18 are amended herein. Claims 7 and 14 are canceled. The remaining claims remain unchanged. No new matter is added by the amendments to the claims herein.

Three Month Extension of Time

The Applicant has submitted a three month petition for an extension of time. The required fee for the extension of time is submitted herewith.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention. Applicants thank the examiner for bringing this informality to their attention. Applicants submit that the amendment to claim 13 obviates this rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-12, 13-19, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Troutman et al. (US Pub. NO. 2004/0002559). Although Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection, Applicants believe that the amendments to claims 1 and 13 renders these rejections moot.

Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the coating composition contains a chemical initiator for initiating the free radical curing reaction. Claim 13 has been amended to indicate that the claimed initiator is an organic peroxide initiator. Troutman et al. does not teach a coating composition including a chemical initiator, such as organic peroxide, for the free radical curing reaction, but rather refers only UV-cured coatings.

As claims 1 and 13 appear to be novel over Troutman et al., claims 3, 4, 7-12, 13-19 and 22 should also be deemed novel over the cited prior art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5, 20, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Troutman et al. in view of Pirig et al. (US Pat. No.6,054,513). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Troutman et al. in view of Fessler et al. (US Pat. No. 3,635,970). Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Troutman et al. Claims 21, 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Troutman et al. in view of Srail et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,286,576).

While Applicants disagree with the Examiner's rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments to claims 1 and 13 render these rejections moot.

Since, as explained above, Troutman et al. does not disclose all of the elements of the coating composition as recited in claims 1 and 13, the combinations of the cited references would also not teach all of the elements of the claims which depend therefrom. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that such rejections be withdrawn and submit that additional arguments are not necessary.

While Applicants believe that the above response is sufficient to overcome the rejections, Applicants reserve the right to present additional arguments and evidence in support of the patentability of the claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims in the present application are patentable in view of the cited prior art. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby respectfully requested.

Double Patenting

Claims 1, 3-8, and 12-18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of co-pending Application No. 11/722,347. Also, claims 1, 3-9, and 12 are provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-20 of co-pending Application No. 11/722,248.

Applicants notes the provisional double patenting issues and will address them at a later time, if necessary, when it is known what form the relevant claims of Application Nos. 11/722,247 and 11/722,248 will take.

Conclusion

While Applicants believe that the above response is sufficient to overcome the rejections, Applicants reserve the right to present additional arguments and evidence in support of the patentability of the claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims in the present application are patentable in view of the cited prior art. Based upon the arguments and amendments above, the rejections should be withdrawn. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 3-6, 8-13, and 15-25 is hereby respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees incurred as a result of the filing hereof or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account Number 02-0900.

Respectfully submitted,
/daniel j. holmander/

Daniel J. Holmander, Esq.
Reg. No. 59,518

BARLOW, JOSEPHS & HOLMES, Ltd.
101 Dyer Street, 5th Floor
Providence, RI 02903
(401) 273-4446 (tel)
(401) 273-4447 (fax)
djh@barjos.com